## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

Lonny Bristow, Plaintiff

Case No. C-1-07-401

VS

William A. Eleby,

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Defendant

(Dlott, J.; Hogan, M.J.)

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and/or Preliminary Injunction (Doc. 8); and Defendant's Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and/or Preliminary Injunction (Doc. 13). Plaintiff, an inmate at Southern Ohio Correctional Facility ("S.O.C.F."), brings this action claiming that Defendant violated his rights under the Eighth Amendment. Plaintiff seeks an order either prohibiting S.O.C.F. from housing Plaintiff at the same institution as inmate Steve Hamilton, namely S.O.C.F., or requiring that Plaintiff be placed in protective control at another institution. (Id.).

In determining whether to issue a temporary restraining order, this Court must balance the following factors:

- 1. Whether the party seeking the injunction has shown a substantial likelihood of success on the merits;
- 2. Whether the party seeking the injunction will suffer irreparable harm absent the injunction;
- 3. Whether an injunction will cause others to suffer substantial harm; and
- 4. Whether the public interest would be served by a preliminary injunction.

U.S. v. Bayshore Associates, Inc., 934 F.2d 1391, 1398 (6th Cir. 1991); In Re King World Productions, Inc., 898 F.2d 56, 59 (6th Cir. 1990); Project Vote! V. Ohio Bureau of Employment Services, 578 F. Supp. 7, 9 (S.D. Ohio 1982) (Spiegel, J.). See also Southern Milk Sales, Inc. v. Martin, 924 F.2d 98, 103 n.3 (6th Cir. 1991); Newsom v. Norris, 888 F.2d 371, 373 (6th Cir. 1989); Frisch's Restaurant, Inc. v. Shoney's, Inc., 759 F.2d 1261, 1263 (6th Cir. 1985).

The Court finds that Plaintiff has neither alleged facts, nor submitted evidence, warranting an immediate injunction in this matter. Plaintiff has made no attempt to apply the above factors to his situation. Plaintiff has failed to present any evidence showing he has a substantial likelihood of success on the merits of his constitutional claim, or that he will suffer irreparable harm absent an immediate injunction.

A preliminary injunction is also not warranted in this case because the purpose of a preliminary injunction, that is, to preserve the status quo until a trial on the merits can be held, see Martin, 924 F.2d at 102, would not be served. The present status quo in this case is, according to Plaintiff, that he has suffered a violation of his constitutional rights under the Eighth Amendment. The remedy Plaintiff presently seeks is more than an injunction maintaining the status quo; he seeks an Order from this Court requiring Defendants to affirmatively correct constitutional deficiencies yet to be proven. Such affirmative relief is generally beyond the scope and purpose of preliminary injunctive relief. See id.

**IT IS THEREFORE RECOMMENDED THAT** Plaintiff's motion (Doc. 8) be DENIED.

Date

Timothy S. Hogan

United States Magistrate Judge

| SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION  | COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <ul> <li>Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired.</li> <li>Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.</li> <li>Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.</li> </ul> |   | ☐ Agent ☐ Addressee C. Date of Delivery |
| 1. Article Addressed to:<br>Lonny Bristow 357-921<br>SOCF<br>PO Box 45699  | D. Is delivery address different from item     If YES, enter delivery address below | <b>—</b>                                |
| Lucasville, OH 45689   | 3. Septice Type  Solution Certified Mail  | pt for Merchandise                      |
| 2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)  | 0860 0000 1409 85   | 44                                      |
| PS Form 3811, August 2001 Domestic Ref   | rum Receipt   | 102595-01-M-250                         |

1:07cv401 Doc. 16

۲.